

Appl. No. 10/708,602
Amdt. dated Oct. 04, 2005
Reply to Office action of July 15, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Objection to the drawings:

The drawings are objected to because the "helix" of claim 5 must be shown or the feature cancelled from the claim. No new matter should be entered.

5

Response:

Claim 5 has been cancelled, and is no longer in need of consideration. Acceptance of the drawings is respectfully requested.

10

2. Objection to claim 5:

Claim 5 is objected to due to grammar informalities.

Response:

Claim 5 has been cancelled, and is no longer in need of consideration.

15

3. Rejection of claims 1, 3, 4, and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e):

Claims 1, 3, 4, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Miyata et al. (US 6,601,959).

20

Response:

Independent claim 1 has been amended to overcome this rejection. Claim 1 now contains the limitations previously found in claim 2, and claim 2 has been subsequently cancelled. No new matter is added through this amendment. Claim 2 had previously been indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form. Reconsideration of claims 1, 3, 4, and 6 is respectfully requested.

25

Appl. No. 10/708,602
Amdt. dated Oct. 04, 2005
Reply to Office action of July 15, 2005

4. Introduction to new claims 11-22:

New claim 11 contains the limitations previously found in original claims 1 and 7. Claims 12-14 are duplicates of claims 8-10, respectively. Claim 7 had previously been indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form.

5

New claim 15 is based on the original claim 1, and also contains limitations that specify that the adjustment member linearly moves at least one of the front and rear optical modules along the optical axis of the optical projection module. This limitation is supported in Figures 3 and 4 and throughout the specification, including paragraph 0020.

10 No new matter is added through any of the new claims 11-22.

While the claimed adjustment member moves the front or rear optical modules along the optical axis, Miyata et al teach in Figures 1(a) and 1(b) that an adjusting member 50 is used for adjusting the relative position of a fixed frame 12 and a rotating frame 14.

15 However, Miyata et al do not teach that the adjusting member 50 adjusts either the fixed frame 12 or the rotating frame 14 linearly along the optical axis of the optical projection module. Instead, Miyata et al teach adjusting the frames in a different direction than the optical axis.

20 For these reasons, claim 15 is patentably distinct with respect to Miyata et al. Claims 16-22 are duplicates of original claims 2-3 and 6-10, respectively. Acceptance of new claims 11-22 is respectfully requested.

25 Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Appl. No. 10/708,602
Amdt. dated Oct. 04, 2005
Reply to Office action of July 15, 2005

Sincerely yours,

5

Winston Hsu

Date: Oct. 04, 2005

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

10 e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)